

(8-14-95)

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

STUDY 6

CHEM 059101

Chlorpyrifos

\$164-1

FORMULATION--12--EMULSIFIABLE CONCENTRATE (EC)

STUDY ID 42924802

Racke, K.D., and C.K. Robb. 1993a. Dissipation of chlorpyrifos in cool-season turfgrass and fallow soil in Indiana. Laboratory Study ID: ENV90126. Unpublished study performed by Heartland Technologies, Inc., Indianapolis, IN (field operations); and DowElanco, Indianapolis, IN (laboratory analysis). Submitted by DowElanco, Indianapolis, IN.

DIRECT REVIEW TIME - 26

REVIEWED BY: M. Dillman

TITLE: Staff Scientist

EDITED BY: K. Ferguson
C. Cooke

TITLE: Task Leader
Staff Scientist

APPROVED BY: W. Spangler

TITLE: Project Manager

ORG: Dynamac Corporation
Rockville, MD
TEL: 301-417-9800

APPROVED BY: S. Syslo

TITLE: Environmental Scientist
ORG: EFGWB/EFED/OPP
TEL: 703-305-6355

SIGNATURE:

CONCLUSIONS:

Field Dissipation - Terrestrial

1. This study can be used towards the fulfillment of data requirements.
2. Chlorpyrifos (0,0-diethyl 0-3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridyl phosphorothioate) dissipated with an initial (days 0-28) half-life of approximately 9 days and a secondary (days 28-119) half-life of 28.4-37.4 days in the 0- to 15-cm depth of bareground and turf-covered plots of clay loam soil located in Indiana that were treated once at 4 lb ai/A with chlorpyrifos (Dursban Turf Insecticide, 45.4% EC) in June 1991. Two degradates, 3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol (TCP) and 3,5,6-trichloro-2-methoxy pyridine (TMP), were isolated from the treated soils at average maximum concentrations of 1.01 at 5 days

posttreatment and 0.06 ug/g at 28-56 days posttreatment, respectively. Chlorpyrifos, TCP, and TMP were ≤ 0.01 ug/g below a soil depth of 10 cm.

3. This study is acceptable and partially fulfills EPA Data Requirements for Registering Pesticides by providing information on the dissipation of the EC formulation of chlorpyrifos (O,O-diethyl O-3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridyl phosphorothioate) from bareground and turf-covered plots of clay loam soil treated at 4 lb ai/A.
4. This study may be used to support the registration of the EC formulation of chlorpyrifos at a maximum application of 4 lb ai/A. Information on the dissipation of the EC formulation of chlorpyrifos at 4 lb ai/A on bareground and turf-covered field plots at a second site (Florida) is provided in Study 1 of this submission (MRID 42924801).

METHODOLOGY:

Chlorpyrifos (O,O-diethyl O-3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridyl phosphorothioate; Dursban Turf Insecticide, 45.4% EC, DowElanco) was applied once at 4 lb ai/A to three bareground and three turf-covered plots (each 20 x 50 feet, approximately 0.02 acres) of Crosby clay loam soil (31.8-32.8% sand, 32.6-36.6% silt, 30.6-35.6% clay, 2.2-2.8% organic matter, pH 6.2-6.3, CEC 12.2-16.0 meq/100 g) located in Hamilton County, Indiana (Figure 2). The broadcast applications were made on June 27, 1991, using a tractor-mounted boom sprayer; in the vegetated plots at the time of treatment, the height of the Kentucky bluegrass was 2 inches, and the thickness of the thatch layer was approximately 0.4 inches. Untreated bareground and turf-covered plots (each 20 x 50 feet) located 90 feet from the treated plots were maintained as controls. During the study, all plots were sprinkler-irrigated to maintain $>100\%$ of the normal monthly rainfall, and the turfgrass plots were mowed, fertilized, and irrigated "in a typical fashion to that of home or commercial lawns in the region." Five soil cores were randomly collected from each treated plot 1 day prior to and immediately after treatment, and at 5, 14, 28, 56, 119, 242, and 361 days posttreatment. Five soil cores were collected from each untreated plot prior to treatment of the test plots, and at 119 and 361 days. At the time of sampling, the turf, thatch, and upper 10 cm of soil (upper 15 cm immediately posttreatment only) were collected using a probe (2.25-inch id) equipped with an acetate liner. The soil core was removed intact with the liner, then immediately capped and placed in a cooler, and the stainless steel core sleeve was left in the ground. At the 5- through 360-day posttreatment sampling intervals, a second probe (1.5-inch id) equipped with an acetate liner was inserted through the sample hole to a depth of 90 cm using an electric hammer. The soil core was removed intact with the liner, capped, and placed in a cooler; the resulting hole was filled with untreated soil and marked to prevent resampling. The soil samples were frozen and shipped on dry ice to the analytical laboratory within 4 hours of collection. Samples were

stored frozen for <4 months prior to analysis for chlorpyrifos, and for <26 months for 3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol [pages 23-24].

At the analytical laboratory, the deeper soil cores were divided into 10- to 30-, 30- to 50-, 50- to 70-, and 70- to 90-cm segments. The soil core segments were ground with dry ice in a Wiley mill "to a uniform consistency"; samples containing turfgrass and thatch were ground so that the plant material was "uniformly mixed" with the soil. With the exception of the immediate posttreatment 0- to 15-cm soil segments, which were analyzed individually [pages 25-26], the soil segments were composited by plot, sampling interval, and soil depth; composited samples were stored frozen in glass jars until analysis (storage conditions not further described).

The soil was analyzed for chlorpyrifos, 3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol (TCP), and 3,5,6-trichloro-2-methoxy pyridine (TMP) using analytical methods ACR 91.5, GRM 92.12, and ACR 86.4, respectively. The limit of quantification for all methods was 0.01 ug/g. To isolate chlorpyrifos, soil samples were extracted by shaking with acetone for 1 hour; the mixtures were then centrifuged, and the supernatants removed. Aliquots of the acetone extract were acidified and partitioned with hexane; the hexane solution was analyzed by capillary GC using flame-photometric detection in the phosphorus mode. Recovery efficiencies from soil samples fortified with chlorpyrifos at 0.01-4.0 ug/g ranged from 70-128% of the applied, and averaged $94 \pm 11\%$. To isolate TCP, soil samples were initially extracted with acidified acetone (acetone:0.1 N HCl; 90:10, v:v) by sonicating for 15 minutes, followed by shaking for 2 hours; the mixtures were then centrifuged, and the supernatants removed. Aliquots of the acidified acetone extract were concentrated by evaporation to remove the acetone, mixed with an acidified aqueous saturated solution of NaCl, and filtered through a C-18 reverse-phase column. The sorbed TCP was eluted from the column with methanol; the methanol eluate was then diluted with acidified saturated NaCl solution, and the mixture was partitioned with toluene. Residues in the toluene solution were derivatized to TCP-TMS (TCP-trimethylsilyl) with N,O-bis(trimethylsilyl)acetamide [BSA], and the derivatized solutions were analyzed by GC/MS. Recovery efficiencies from soil samples fortified with TCP at 0.01-1.00 ug/g ranged from 65-123% of the applied, and averaged $93 \pm 17\%$. To isolate TMP, soil samples were extracted by shaking with acidified hexane (hexane:7.3 M phosphoric acid:water; 40:1:10, v:v:v) for 1 hour. The mixtures were centrifuged, and the hexane layer was removed by pipette. Aliquots of the hexane extract were analyzed by GC with electron-capture detection. Recovery efficiencies from soil samples fortified with TMP at 0.01-0.10 ug/g ranged from 81-117% of the applied, and averaged $93 \pm 9\%$ (one recovery value at 153% was considered anomalous).

DATA SUMMARY:

Chlorpyrifos (O,O-diethyl O-3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridyl phosphorothioate) dissipated with an initial (days 0-28) half-life of approximately 9 days and a secondary (days 28-119) half-life of 28.4-37.4 days in the 0- to 15-cm depth of bareground and turf-covered plots of clay loam soil located in Indiana that were treated once at 4 lb ai/A with chlorpyrifos (Dursban Turf Insecticide, 45.4% EC) in June 1991 (Tables XI and XII). Two degradates,

3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol (TCP) and

3,5,6-trichloro-2-methoxy pyridine (TMP),

were isolated from the treated soils at average maximum concentrations of 1.01 and 0.06 ug/g, respectively. Chlorpyrifos and TMP were not detected (<0.01 ug/g) below a soil depth of 10 cm; TCP was detected once, at an average 0.01 ug/g, in the 10- to 30-cm depth. Chlorpyrifos and its degradates were not detected in the control plots at any sampling interval.

In the upper 15 cm of the bareground plots, chlorpyrifos was 1.01-2.31 ug/g immediately posttreatment (average 1.66 ug/g; Table XII and Appendix J). In the upper 10 cm of soil, chlorpyrifos was 0.61-1.34 ug/g at 5 days posttreatment, 0.30-0.48 ug/g at 14 days, 0.12-0.32 ug/g at 28 days, 0.04-0.12 ug/g at 56 days, and 0.02 ug/g at 119 days. TCP increased to a maximum average of 1.01 ug/g at 5 days posttreatment, and averaged 0.56-0.60 ug/g at 14 and 28 days, and 0.04 ug/g at 119 days; TMP was a maximum average of 0.06 ug/g at 28 and 56 days.

In the upper 15 cm of the vegetated plots, chlorpyrifos was 0.85-3.61 ug/g immediately posttreatment (average 1.90 ug/g; Table XI and Appendix G). In the upper 10 cm of soil, chlorpyrifos was 0.96-1.21 ug/g at 5 days posttreatment, 0.45-0.77 ug/g at 14 days, 0.21-0.23 ug/g at 28 days, and 0.04-0.05 ug/g at 119 days. TCP increased to a maximum average of 0.09 ug/g at 5 and 14 days posttreatment, and averaged 0.04 ug/g at 56 and 119 days; TMP averaged ≤ 0.01 ug/g at all sampling intervals. In the vegetated plots at the time of treatment, the height of the Kentucky bluegrass was 2 inches, and the thickness of the thatch layer was approximately 0.4 inches.

Between June and October 1991, average monthly air temperatures ranged from 57-75°C; average monthly soil temperatures ranged from 57-77 and 57-76°C at the 2- and 4-inch depths, respectively. During the first 14 days of the experiment, the test plots were irrigated with 1.0 inches of water immediately posttreatment, received 0.3 inches of rain at 5 days, were irrigated with 1.0 inches of water at 9 days, and received 1.02 and 0.3 inches of rain at 11 and 13 days, respectively. Rainfall plus irrigation totaled 22.71 inches between June and October 1991, which was equivalent to 133.4% of the 30-year average rainfall. The slope of the test plots was 1-2%, and the depth to the water table was a minimum of 5-6 feet [page 15].

COMMENTS:

1. Sampling procedures were changed during the experiment, which resulted in 0- to 15-cm soil segments being collected immediately after treatment and 0- to 10-cm segments being collected at 5 through 361 days; no explanation for the change was provided. Since it is probable that the chlorpyrifos residues were not evenly distributed through the surface soil segment, but were concentrated in the uppermost part of the segment, there is no way to accurately convert the data to produce concentrations for similar-sized segments. The 10- to 15-cm soil segment probably served to dilute the chlorpyrifos residues; therefore, the immediate posttreatment concentrations of chlorpyrifos residues are "low" compared to concentrations measured at later sampling intervals.
2. Immediately posttreatment, the concentrations of chlorpyrifos in the treated bareground and turf-covered plots averaged 80.7 and 74.3%, respectively, of the nominal application rate of 4 lb ai/A (Table X). Analysis of samples of the tank mix used to make the application yielded an actual chlorpyrifos concentration of 0.59%; the theoretical concentration was calculated to be 0.54%.
3. Using data for 0 through 28 days posttreatment, the study author calculated initial half-lives for chlorpyrifos of 8.7-9.8 days in the turf-covered plots and 7.2-13.5 days in the bareground plots. However, in both cases, the observed half-life appears to be 7 days. The longer calculated half-lives reflect the biphasic nature of the degradation of chlorpyrifos; the rate of chlorpyrifos degradation slowed considerably between later sampling intervals.
4. The soil was analyzed only for chlorpyrifos, 3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol (TCP) and 3,5,6-trichloro-2-methoxy pyridine (TMP). In previously reviewed aerobic soil metabolism studies (MRIDs 00154723, 00155636, 00155637, 00025619, 40050401, and 42144911), TCP was the only significant nonvolatile degradate of chlorpyrifos. On infrequent occasions, minor amounts of TMP were isolated from the soils during incubation.
5. The study authors stated in the report that chlorpyrifos, TCP, and TMP were stable during frozen storage and presented data to this effect (Table IX). The chlorpyrifos and TMP storage stability data are reviewed in this report (Studies RES91031 and RES91032, respectively; Study 3) and show that chlorpyrifos and TMP are stable during frozen storage in glass jars. However, the information on TCP was derived from a summary report (Gardner and Schotts, 1993: Frozen storage stability of triclopyr, 3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol, and 3,5,6-trichloro-2-methoxy pyridine [MRID 42630101]) which included information from only one soil. No details about the storage conditions, such as type of sample container, temperature of the freezer, and the moisture content of the soil were provided.

6. To determine the stability of chlorpyrifos and its degradates during shipping and handling, separate soil samples from the control plots were treated in the analytical laboratory with chlorpyrifos at 1.0 ug/g, TCP at 1.0 ug/g, or TMP at 0.1 ug/g. Fortified samples were analyzed for initial concentration of chlorpyrifos and TMP using the methods previously described; samples fortified with TCP were analyzed using method ACR 84.2 (described below). Portions were either stored frozen or shipped to the field site; shipped samples were then reshipped to the analytical laboratory under the same conditions expected for the test samples and analyzed within one day of return shipment receipt. Recoveries from the samples that were not shipped were 98% of the applied for chlorpyrifos, 102% for TCP, and 80% for TMP; recoveries of the samples that were shipped were 95-97% for chlorpyrifos, 100-108% for TCP, and 78-80% for TMP.
7. The analytical method used to determine the concentration of TCP in the shipped stability study was different from that used for the field samples. Using method ACR 84.2 (MRID 40356608), TCP was extracted from the soil by heating with methanolic sodium hydroxide (methanol:10% sodium hydroxide; 8:1, v:v). Aliquots of the extracts were diluted with acidified aqueous saturated NaCl solution and then extracted by shaking with toluene. (Note: Document describing method ACR 84.2 states that organic phase was benzene). The toluene phase was removed and extracted by shaking with 0.25 M sodium bicarbonate for 5 minutes; after centrifugation, the toluene phase was discarded. The aqueous phase was acidified with a small amount of concentrated HCl and filtered through a C-18 Sep-Pak cartridge. The sorbed TCP was eluted from the cartridge with methanol; the methanol eluate was then diluted with acidified water and the mixture was partitioned with toluene. Residues in the toluene phase were derivatized to TCP-TMS (TCP-trimethylsilyl) with N,O-bis(trimethylsilyl)acetamide [BSA], and the derivatized solutions were analyzed by capillary GC with electron capture detection. Reported recovery efficiencies during method validation from soil samples fortified with TCP at 0.05-1.0 ug/g ranged from 76-116% of the applied, and averaged $94 \pm 7\%$.
8. The analytical method for chlorpyrifos (ACR 91.5) had been previously reviewed by EFGWB (review of MRID 42874702 dated 8/30/93; attached); Copies of the analytical methods for TCP (GRM 92.12.R2) and TMP (ACR 86.4) are included as Appendix A and B, respectively, of Study 1 of this report.
9. Soil samples collected at 242 days posttreatment were not analyzed because they were "lost" after receipt at the analytical laboratory [page 7926].
10. The test plots had been part of a soybean-corn-soybean rotation during the 3 years prior to treatment with chlorpyrifos, and had been treated with alachlor, atrazine, isazophos, linuron, and metolachlor.

WFO 429 24802

Page _____ is not included in this copy.

Pages 7 through 27 are not included.

The material not included contains the following type of information:

- ☐ Identity of product inert ingredients.
- ☐ Identity of product impurities.
- ☐ Description of the product manufacturing process.
- ☐ Description of quality control procedures.
- ☐ Identity of the source of product ingredients.
- ☐ Sales or other commercial/financial information.
- ☐ A draft product label.
- ☐ The product confidential statement of formula.
- ☐ Information about a pending registration action.
- ☒ FIFRA registration data.
- ☐ The document is a duplicate of page(s) _____.
- ☐ The document is not responsive to the request.

The information not included is generally considered confidential by product registrants. If you have any questions, please contact the individual who prepared the response to your request.
